



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,600	08/25/2003	Namit Jain	50277-2235	4275
42425	7590	09/10/2010	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE			RADTKE, MARK A	
2055 GATEWAY PLACE				
SUITE 550			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083			2165	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
<b>Response to Rule 312 Communication</b>	10/648,600	JAIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MARK A. X RADTKE	2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1.  The amendment filed on 02 September 2010 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a)  entered.
- b)  entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c)  disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.  
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.
- d)  disapproved. See explanation below.
- e)  entered in part. See explanation below.

First, it is noted that Applicant incorrectly refers to claim 13 on page 7 of the instant Reply. Reference to claim 13 has been interpreted as reference to claim 12.

Applicant's amendment to claim 1 is entered because it does not affect the scope of the invention.

The Examiner is not persuaded that the proposed amendments to claim 12 should be entered. The amendment in question deletes the limitation upon which the BPAI decision was based. See pages 6-7 of the Decision filed 28 May 2010. At the very least, the amendment requires more than a cursory review of the record. See MPEP 714.16(l). Entry of the proposed amendment to claim 12 is disapproved.

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165